UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 VAMSI TADEPALLI.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-04348-MEJ

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION RE: UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Re: Dkt. No. 12

Through an unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement, the parties in this case seek an order (1) preliminarily approving the proposed settlement of this class action on the terms set forth in the parties' proposed Stipulation of Settlement and Release; (2) approving their proposed notice of settlement; (3) certifying a settlement class; and (4) scheduling a final settlement hearing. Dkt. No. 12. Having reviewed the Motion and Settlement Agreement, the Court finds a hearing unnecessary and VACATES the January 14, 2016 hearing. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Prior to issuing an order, the Court requests the parties provide information on why National Consumer Law Center and the East Bay Community Law Center meet the requirements for approval of cy pres recipients set forth in *Dennis v. Kellogg Company*, 697 F.3d 858, 865 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that there must be "a driving nexus between the plaintiff class and the cy pres beneficiaries" and that the cy pres award must be "guided by (1) the objectives of the underlying statute(s) and (2) the interests of the silent class members, . . ., and must not benefit a group too remote from the plaintiff class").

The parties shall respond to this request as soon as possible, but no later than December 16, 2015. No chambers copy is required.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 11, 2015

27

MARIA-ELENA JAMES United States Magistrate Judge